

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/960,431

Applicant(s)

HANSEN ET AL.

Examiner

Jan M. Ludlow

Art Unit

1743

All Participants:

(1) Jan M. Ludlow.

(2) Allan Kiang.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 7 April 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

all

Claims discussed:

all

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.


SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

A message was left via voicemail indicating that the Amendment AF would not be entered and an advisory action would be issued.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The limitation to direct binding raises a new issue requiring further search and/or consideration. Note, for example, that Smith et al (6027945) and Breivik (6090935) each teach direct binding of nucleic acids to magnetic beads for separation, in addition to the patent to the Assignee cited in the disclosure of the instant application..